



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ph

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,005	07/08/2003	Chip Maxson	0008	1031
43699 7590 02/09/2007 GO DADDY GROUP, INC. 14455 NORTH HAYDEN ROAD SUITE 219 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85260			EXAMINER SALL, EL HADJI MALICK	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,005	Applicant(s) MAXSON	
	Examiner El Hadji M. Sall	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/08/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/07/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on July 8, 2003. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-19 represent reseller program for registering domain names through resellers' web sites.

2. **Specification**

The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to U.S. Patent Application Serial Number is ineffective because *the reference document is not clearly identified as required by 37 CFR 1.57(b)(2)*.

The incorporation by reference will not be effective until correction is made to comply with 37 CFR 1.57(b), (c), or (d). If the incorporated material is relied upon to meet any outstanding objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office, the correction must be made within any time period set by the Office for responding to the objection, rejection, or other requirement for the incorporation to be effective. Compliance will not be held in abeyance with respect to responding to the objection, rejection, or other requirement for the incorporation to be effective. In no case may the correction be made later than the close of prosecution as defined in 37 CFR 1.114(b), or abandonment of the application, whichever occurs earlier.

Any correction inserting material by amendment that was previously incorporated by reference must be accompanied by a statement that the material being inserted is the material incorporated by reference and the amendment contains no new matter. 37 CFR 1.57(f).

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink on page 2 of the specification. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

3. *Claim Objections*

Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: they are both system claims that depend on a manufacture claim. Appropriate correction is required.

4. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement

Art Unit: 2157

thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant discloses "a reseller program for allowing a plurality of Customers to register one or more domain names via a Registrar...". For the claimed invention to be statutory, it has to be embedded in computer readable medium.

For purpose of prior art rejection, Examiner will construe claim 1-10 as "a reseller program embodied in a machine readable medium for allowing a plurality of Customers to register one or more domain names via a Registrar".

5.

Double Patenting

-A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101, which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 6 of copending Application No. 10/616,195. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

As to claim 6, Maxson teaches the same invention as in claim 6 of copending Application No. 10/616,195.

6. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bayles U.S. 7,039,697.

Bayles teaches the invention as claimed including registry-integrated Internet domain name acquisition system (see abstract).

As to claims 1, Bayles teaches a reseller program embodied in a machine readable medium and a process for allowing a plurality of Customers to register one or more domain names via a Registrar web site, comprising:

A) means for accepting a plurality of Resellers into a reseller program, wherein each Reseller has at least one reseller web site (column 6, lines 26-28);

B) means for creating a registrar web site for registering domain names with an appropriate Registry web site (figure 2);

C) means for allowing a plurality of reseller web sites to register one or more

Art Unit: 2157

domain names for one or more customers via the registrar web site (column 6, lines 26-28);

D) means for collecting a fee from each Reseller web site that registers a domain name for a Customer via the registrar web site (column 6, lines 32-33).

As to claim 2, Bayles teaches the reseller program and the process of claim 1, wherein the reseller web site has the ability to communicate with the registrar web site or the reseller web site includes Internet links to the registrar web site (figure 2)

As to claims 3, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17, Bayles teaches the reseller program and the process of claims 1, 6, 10 and 14, wherein the reseller web sites communicate with the registrar web site via an application program interface protocol (column 6, lines 57-67; figure 1).

As to claim 4, Bayles teaches the reseller program of claim 1, wherein the actions by one of the plurality of Resellers include creating a link to the registrar web site from another web site (figure 1; column 5, lines 37-46).

As to claims 5, 7, 11 and 15, Bayles teaches the reseller program and the process of claims 1, 6, 10 and 14, further including means to register domain names via a proxy service, wherein proxy contact information is made publicly available while the Customer receives legal rights in the domain name (column 5, lines 32-36).

8. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayles U.S. 7,039,697 in view of Vaidyanathan et al. U.S. 20020138291 (referred to hereafter as Vaid).

Bayles teaches the invention as claimed including registry-integrated Internet domain name acquisition system (see abstract).

As to claim 18, Bayles teaches the reseller program of claim 14.

Art Unit: 2157

Bayles fails to teach explicitly the administration web site offers the option to the resellers to receive electronic payments from the registrar based on activities of their associated customers.

However, Vaid teaches the administration web site offers the option to the resellers to receive electronic payments from the registrar based on activities of their associated customers (page 2, [0019]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bayles in view of Vaid to provide the administration web site offering the option to the resellers to receive electronic payments from the registrar based on activities of their associated customers. One would be motivated to do so to allow paperless transaction.

As to claim 19, Bayles teaches the reseller program of claim 14.

Bayles fails to teach explicitly wherein the administration web site offers the option to the Reseller to display a report showing commission payments during selected time periods.

However, Vaid teaches the administration web site offers the option to the Reseller to display a report showing commission payments during selected time periods (page 1, [0009]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Bayles in view of Vaid to provide the administration web site offers the option to the Reseller to display a report showing commission payments

Art Unit: 2157

during selected time periods. One would be motivated to do so to allow efficient tracking of a reseller commission.

10. Citation of Relevant Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art: 20020091827; 20030105868; 20060161681; 20040167982.

11. Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to El Hadji M Sall whose telephone number is 571-272-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4010.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/616,005

Page 11

Art Unit: 2157

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

El Hadji Sall

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 2157



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2100